

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 26, 1998, has been reviewed, and the continuation data has been updated to reflect the issuance of the parent application. In addition, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to more clearly define Applicant's inventive concept.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 as being anticipated by McIntire et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,281,799). In support of the rejection, the Examiner stated:

McIntire et al discloses the claimed card display package including a card carrier 11 of a sheet of material, a card 16 connected to and selectively detachable from the card carrier, the card having an encodable magnetic strip 38 extending transversely across the portion of the card. Note that the card may be sent through an encoding device without being removed from the card carrier. See column 8, lines 5-61.

It is respectfully submitted that the McIntire et al. reference does not anticipate the combination recited in Applicant's claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 (as amended).

The McIntire et al. reference discloses a card assembly that permits xerographic printing of information on cards. The card assembly includes a carrier sheet having an aperture 14 covered with a suspension sheet 13. An information card is detachably bonded within the aperture to the suspension sheet so that the top surface of the information card is either flush with or recessed from the top surface of the carrier sheet.

It is readily apparent that the McIntire et al. reference does not anticipate Applicants' claims 1, 2, 7, and 8, as amended. With respect to claim 1, the McIntire et al. reference does not

disclose a card having a portion thereof extending beyond an outer edge of the card carrier and the card having an encodable magnetic strip extending transversely across the portion of the card extending beyond the outer edge of the card carrier. In contrast, the card of McIntire et al. is totally encompassed within the carrier sheet.

Likewise, with respect to claim 7, the McIntire et al. reference does not disclose a card connected to the card carrier so that the first side and a portion of the third and fourth sides of the card border the card carrier and the second side and a remaining portion of the third and fourth sides extend beyond the card carrier with an encodable magnetic strip extending transversely across the card between the portions of the third side and the fourth side extending beyond the card carrier. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are not anticipated by the McIntire et al. reference.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the McIntire et al. reference does not disclose, teach or even suggest a device over which one can maintain the inventive concept now recited in claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 is obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103. That is, Applicant respectfully submits that the McIntire et al. reference provides no teaching or suggestion to extend a portion of the card beyond an outer edge of the card carrier and the card.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and pass such claims to issue.

Rejection of Claims 3-6 and 9-12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 6-11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntire et al., as used above.

In support of the rejection, the Examiner stated:

McIntire et al discloses the claimed card display package including a card carrier which is a sheet of transparent material except for the sheet of material to be a synthetic paper or the sheet to be laminated on both sides with a plastic material or having an aperture for suspending the card carrier from peg. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the sheet of material of McIntire to include a synthetic paper or the sheet to be laminated on both sides with a plastic material or having an aperture for suspending the card carrier from peg since Applicant has not disclosed that a synthetic paper or the sheet to be laminated on both sides with a plastic material or having an aperture for suspending the card carrier from peg solves any stated problem and the invention would perform equally as well as the card display package of McIntire et al.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the McIntire et al. reference does not disclose, teach or even suggest the combination recited in Applicant's claims 1, 2, 7, and 8, as amended, and for the same reasons such reference does not render obvious the combination recited in claims 3-6 and 9-12. The comments concerning the teachings of McIntire et al. will not be reiterated herein, but such are deemed relevant to the Examiner's rejection of claims 3-6 and 9-12 and are therefore expressly incorporated herein by reference.

In view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that the combination defined by Applicant's claims 3-6 and 9-12 is not rendered obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6 and 9-12 and pass such claims to issue.

Other References

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied on have been reviewed. However, it is Applicant's belief that none of the references, either singularly or in combination, discloses, teaches or even suggests the inventive concept disclosed and claimed in the subject application. Thus, no further comments concerning such references are deemed necessary.

Summary

It is respectfully submitted that this application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated hereinabove. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider each and every rejection as applicable to the claims now pending in the application and pass such claims to issue.

This Amendment is intended to be a complete response to the Office Action mailed August 26, 1998.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Nicholas D. Rouse, Reg. No. 36,992  
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.  
9400 North Broadway, Suite 420  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73114  
(405) 478-5344

Attorney for Applicant